SENATOR DeCAMP: I agree completely with you, you're right, and I think you may have a problem, double subject and all that kind of...but I don't think you want to strike all of Section 11. Don't you want to just...when an authorized tax levy for the political subdivision affected by this legislation...don't you want to...you see what I'm saying, in this particular situation because you've increased the potential with the mill levy so they can have a two or three hundred percent increase, you don't want to use that averaging mechanism on this particular limited area, the NRDs. So could we redo that amendment so you're striking all the other political subdivisions, but we're still keeping these provisions for just the NRDs. Would that make sense?

SENATOR CARSTEN: I would buy that, Senator DeCamp, but I believe...I believe that we're addressing the very problem that you're saying in the amendment that we're going to be addressing at the hearing on Friday.

SENATOR DeCAMP: You're right.

SENATOR CARSTEN: If you want to amend it to just make this NRDs, I would not be so uptight about it, but I certainly am at this point.

SENATOR DeCAMP: You're completely right in what you say, it's just that, I think you do want to have that mechanism in there on this limited fund of NRDs, but I...off the top of my head I'd have to sit down in a book and look at the right language to make it right, and while you're talking about it I'll sit down and do it if that's okay. Is that okay?

SPEAKER MARVEL: I would suggest that Senator DeCamp and Senator Carsten get together, because we already have an amendment to an amendment and we can't go beyond that, and while they're doing that I will recognize Senator Frank Lewis and then Senator Schmit.

SENATOR LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly can understand Senator Carsten's concern in terms of trying to work out the problems of LB 1. However, the correct solution here is not to eliminate any reference to that section. I would think, first of all, that there's two things that can be done. First of all, you can work out an amendment to specifically pinpoint it to this issue, Mr. President, or you can go under the understanding as Senator Cullan has said to me privately that any law that we subsequently pass, after this one, the provisions then would apply also to this. In other words, the same limitation language would apply back again and the revised statute would make that correction. If it makes Senator Carsten feel better to simply